



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/978,194	10/15/2001	Avi J. Ashkenazi	GNE.2630P1C10	5226
35489	7590	08/17/2005	EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRLMAN LLP 275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3506			KEMMERER, ELIZABETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/978,194	ASHKENAZI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Elizabeth C. Kemmerer, Ph.D.	1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 58-65 and 68-70 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 58-65 and 68-70 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 20 May 2005 has been entered.

It is noted that the previous Advisory Action (mailed 16 September 2004) failed to indicate whether the after final amendment received 15 July 2004 was entered or not. Applicant is advised that the after final amendment was entered.

Claims 1-57, 66, and 67 are canceled. Claims 58-65 and 68-70 are under examination.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, First Paragraph

Claims 58-65 and 68-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

Claims 58-65 and 68-70 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific

and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

The basis for these rejection is set forth in the previous Office Actions. See, for example, the non-final rejection mailed 04 February 2004.

Applicant's arguments (pp. 5-20 of the preliminary amendment received 20 May 2005) have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive for the following reasons. The Goddard declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 20 May 2005 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 58-65 and 68-70 based upon 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, as set forth in the last Office action for the following reasons.

Applicant reviews the legal standard for patentable utility, with which the examiner takes no issue.

Applicant argues that the gene amplification assay is well-described in Example 143 (it is assumed that applicant intended assay 114, Table 9), showing that nucleic acids encoding PRO351 were increased more than 2 fold in lung tumors LT9, LT10, LT11, LT13, LT15, LT16, LT17, LT18, LT19, and LT21. Applicant argues that the PRO351 nucleic acid was amplified in a significant number of lung tumors and showed a significant increase in DNA copy number in these tumors. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. While the data in Table 9 may provide a basis for utility and enablement of PRO351 nucleic acid, it does not provide a basis for utility or enablement of the claimed polypeptides. The art supports this position by establishing that there is no strong correlation between gene amplification and increased mRNA or protein levels. See Haynes et al., Pennica et al., Konopka et al. of

record. Furthermore, the art recognizes that lung epithelium is at risk for cellular damage due to direct exposure to environmental pollutants and carcinogens, which result in aneuploidy before the epithelial cells turn cancerous. See Hittelman (2001, Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 952:1-12), who teach that damaged, precancerous lung epithelium is often aneuploid. See especially p. 4, Figure 4. The gene amplification assay does not provide a comparison between the lung tumor samples and normal lung epithelium, and thus it is not clear that PRO351 is amplified in cancerous lung epithelium more than in damaged (non-cancerous) lung epithelium. One skilled in the art would not conclude that PRO351 is a diagnostic probe for lung cancer unless it is clear that PRO351 is amplified to a clearly greater extent in true lung tumor tissue relative to non-cancerous lung epithelium. Also, while it might be argued in hindsight that PRO351 would still be a marker at least for precancerous, or damaged, lung epithelium, such is not suggested by the specification as originally filed and is not well-established in the *prior* art. Furthermore, even if it could be established that gene amplification is reflected by increased polypeptide levels, the claims are broadly drawn to polypeptides that can be variants of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 132, including fragments and substitution variants. One skilled in the art would expect that such variant sequences would not reasonably be expected to show changed levels for a particular disease state.

Applicant points to the Goddard declaration as stating that an at least 2 fold increase in gene copy number in a tumor tissue sample relative to a normal sample is significant, and that the gene can be used as a diagnostic marker. This has been fully

considered but is not found to be persuasive, since the claims are directed to polypeptides, not genes. A change in gene copy number does not reliably correlate with a change in polypeptide expression levels, as evidenced by the references cited herein. Furthermore, Table 9 reports a comparison of lung tumor tissue samples with a pooled sample of DNA from normal cells, but not matched tissue samples (i.e., normal lung epithelium tissue). The Goddard declaration states that a 2 fold increase in gene copy number in a tumor sample relative to a non-tumor sample is significant. However, it is not clear if Dr. Goddard intended the phrase "normal samples" to include unrelated tissue samples such as those used in the specification. The art uses matched tissue samples as a rule when evaluating whether or not a protein can be used as a diagnostic for cancer, indicating that the art does not consider pooled, unrelated DNA samples to be an appropriate control. See Hu et al. (2003, Journal of Proteome Research 2:405-412) and Chen et al. (2002, Molecular and Cellular Proteomics 1:304-313).

Applicant criticizes Pennica et al. and Konopka et al. as being limited to only one gene. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Pennica et al. and Konopka et al. constitute evidence that one skilled in the art cannot assume that any one gene's amplification results in protein over-expression. The issue at hand also concerns only one gene and the protein it encodes.

Applicant criticizes Haynes et al., stating that there is no legal requirement to establish a necessary or strong correlation between an increase in copy number of mRNA and protein expression levels. Applicant argues that the issue is whether or not it is more likely than not that a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would

recognize a positive correlation between mRNA expression levels and protein expression levels. Applicant argues that there is a positive correlation between most of the 80 proteins studied by Haynes et al. Applicant argues that Haynes et al. is not relevant because it is limited to yeast genes, not human genes. Applicant argues that Haynes et al. failed to compare mRNA expression levels and protein expression levels in the same yeast cells. Applicant concludes that the reliance on Haynes et al. is misplaced, since it shows a general trend between mRNA and protein levels, and that an improper, heightened legal standard has been applied. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Haynes et al. clearly conclude that, "even for a population of genes predicted to be relatively homogeneous with respect to protein half-life and gene expression, the protein levels cannot be accurately predicted from the level of the corresponding mRNA transcript" (p. 1863, section 2.1). Regarding the relevance of yeast genes, Applicant is directed to Lian et al. (2001, Blood 98:513-524) who show a similar lack of correlation in mammalian (mouse) cells (see p. 514, top of left column: "The results suggest a poor correlation between mRNA expression and protein abundance, indicating that it may be difficult to extrapolate directly from individual mRNA changes to corresponding ones in protein levels."). See also Fessler et al. (2002, J. Biol. Chem. 277:31291-31302) who found a "[p]oor concordance between mRNA transcript and protein expression changes" in human cells (p. 31291, abstract). The evidence as a whole clearly indicates that one skilled in the art would not assume that an increase in gene copy number would correspond with an increase in mRNA levels or protein levels without doing the empirical experimentation necessary to

measure mRNA and protein levels. The requirement for such empirical experimentation indicates that the asserted utility for the claimed polypeptides is not substantial; it is not in currently available form.

Applicant discusses the Orntoft, Hyman and Pollack references. Orntoft et al. (*Molecular and Cellular Proteomics* 1:37-45, 2002) *could only compare the levels of about 40 well-resolved and focused abundant proteins.*" (See abstract.) It would appear that applicants have provided no fact or evidence concerning a correlation between the specification's disclosure of low levels of amplification of DNA (which were not characterized on the basis of those in the Orntoft publication) and an associated rise in level of the encoded protein. Hyman (*Cancer Research* 62:6240-6245) found 44% of *highly* amplified genes showed overexpression at the mRNA level, and 10.5% of *highly* overexpressed genes were amplified; thus, even at the level of high amplification and high overexpression, the two do not correlate. Further, the article at page 6244 states that of the 12,000 transcripts analyzed, a set of 270 was identified in which overexpression was attributable to gene amplification. This proportion is approximately 2%; the Examiner maintains that 2% does not provide a reasonable expectation that the slight amplification of PRO351 would be correlated with elevated levels of mRNA, much less protein. Hyman does not examine protein expression. Pollack et al. is similarly limited to highly amplified genes which were not evaluated by the method of the instant specification.

Applicant refers again to the Polakis declaration, and argues that the examiner's criticism of the declaration for failing to provide data is improper. However, given the

Art Unit: 1646

evidence in the art that increased DNA amplification does not necessarily correlate with increased mRNA levels, and that increased mRNA levels do not necessarily correlate with increased protein levels, the examiner maintains that one skilled in the art would view the instant gene amplification data as merely preliminary with regard to whether or not mRNA or protein levels of PRO351 are specifically amplified in tumors. Further research would have to be done in order to determine if PRO351 mRNA and protein are amplified and, if so, whether or not the amplification is significant enough to indicate PRO351 protein as a cancer marker.

Applicant argues that the examiner must accept an opinion from a qualified expert. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. In assessing the weight to be given expert testimony, the examiner may properly consider, among other things, the nature of the fact sought to be established, the strength of any opposing evidence, the interest of the expert in the outcome of the case, and the presence or absence of factual support for the expert's opinion. See Ex parte Simpson, 61 USPQ2d 1009 (BPAI 2001), Cf. Redac Int'l. Ltd. v. Lotus Development Corp., 81 F.3d 1576, 38 USPQ2d 1665 (Fed. Cir. 1996), Paragon Podiatry Lab., Inc. v. KLM Lab., Inc., 948 F.2d 1182, 25 USPQ2d 1561, (Fed. Cir. 1993). In the instant case, the nature of the fact is whether or not there is a correlation between mRNA levels and protein levels. There is strong opposing evidence that there is no strong correlation between the two. The expert has a strong interest in the outcome of the case, as Dr. Polakis is employed by the assignee. Finally, while Dr. Polakis refers to his experiments, only conclusions were set forth in the declaration. No data or results were presented for

Art Unit: 1646

independent analysis. In view of the totality of the evidence, including the declarations submitted under 37 CFR 1.132 and the publications of record, the instant utility rejection is appropriate.

Applicant criticizes the examiner's reliance on Hu et al. Applicant argues that Hu et al. is not relevant, as it does not discuss gene amplification. Applicant criticizes Hu et al. as being base don a statistical analysis of information published in the literature. This ahs been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. The asserted utility for the claimed polypeptides is based on a sequence of presumptions. First, it is presumed that gene amplification predicts increased mRNA production. Second, it is presumed that increased mRNA production leads to increased protein production. Hu et al. is directly on point by showing that the second presumption is incorrect when designating proteins as diagnostic markers for cancer. Hu et al. (2003, Journal of Proteome Research 2:405-412) analyzed 2286 genes that showed a greater than 1-fold difference in mean expression level between breast cancer samples and normal samples in a microarray (p. 408, middle of right column) and discovered that, for genes displaying a 5-fold change or less in tumors compared to normal, there was no evidence of a correlation between altered gene expression and a known role in the disease. However, among genes with a 10-fold or more change in expression level, there was a strong and significant correlation between expression level and a published role in the disease (see discussion section). The instant specification does not disclose that PRO351 mRNA levels are expressed at 10-fold or higher levels compared with normal, matched tissue samples. Therefore, based on Hu et al., the skilled artisan would not reasonably expect

that PRO351 protein can be sued as a cancer diagnostic. Furthermore, Applicant's attention is directed to Hanna et al. (of record, Pathology Associates Medical Laboratories, 1999), who show that gene amplification does not reliably correlate with polypeptide over-expression, and thus the level of polypeptide expression must be tested empirically. The instant specification does not provide this additional information, and thus the skilled artisan would need to perform additional experiments. Since the asserted utility for the claimed polypeptides is not in currently available form, the asserted utility is not substantial.

Applicant criticizes Hu et al. as using faulty statistical analysis. This has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Applicant is holding Hu et al. to a higher standard than their own specification, which does not provide proper statistical analysis such as reproducibility, standard error rates, etc.

It is important to note that the specification does not actually assert that the claimed polypeptides can be used as cancer diagnostics in Example 114. Rather, it is asserted that the polypeptides or their antibodies can be sued to develop cancer therapeutics. However, this asserted utility is not substantial, since the specification does not provide a clear nexus between PRO351 and cancer occurrence or progression, for reasons noted above.

Thus, the preponderance of the art supports the *prima facie* finding that a minor amplification of DNA would not form the basis for a substantial assertion of an association between PRO351 protein and cancer.

Claims 58-62, 69, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are directed to isolated "native sequence" polypeptides having at least 80%-99% identity to SEQ ID NO: 132, wherein the nucleic acid encoding the polypeptide is amplified in lung tumors. The specification discloses a single amino acid sequence for PRO351, SEQ ID NO: 132. There is a utility and enablement issue regarding whether or not the nucleic acid encoding PRO351 is amplified in lung tumors (see rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, above). Furthermore, the specification does not disclosure any variants of SEQ ID NO: 132, naturally occurring or not, nor whether such sequences are amplified in lung tumors.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

With the exception of SEQ ID NO: 132, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polypeptides, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or

simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written *description* for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated polypeptides comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 132, but not the *full* breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth C. Kemmerer, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Art Unit: 1646

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ECK



ELIZABETH KEMMERER
PRIMARY EXAMINER